

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed October 2, 2006, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings since the specification does not mention reference numeral "3" shown in FIG 1. In response, the specification has been amended to include reference numeral "3". Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner suggested adding headings to the specification. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's suggestion, however respectfully declines to add the headings as they are not required in accordance with MPEP §608.01(a).

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Abstract for a certain informality. In response, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which

corrects the informality noted by the Examiner, and better conforms to U.S. practice. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the Abstract is respectfully requested.

In the office action, the Examiner objected to the specification for a certain informality. In response, the specification has been amended to correct the informality noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0159741 (Graves). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Graves. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-20 are patentable over Graves for at least the following reasons.

Graves is directed to a transparent optical transmission tube 1 incorporated at various locations of a vehicle. Graves over 47 figures and 43 pages qualifying this patent as "complex". Therefore pursuant to 37 CFR 1.104, the Examiner must indicate how the reference is being applied. The indicated sections of Graves, such as page 3, paragraph [0081], merely teach that the Graves

transmission tube 1 allows "light to be transmitted substantially along its entirety from a light source 2."

Further, on page 4, paragraph [0095] of Graves merely teaches that the transmission tube 1 may be:

integrated into or attached to the vehicle in such a manner to illuminate the license plate. ... Based on the ability to directionally emit light from the tube 1, the illumination can be limited to the license plate thereby providing bright illumination thereof and no stray light to annoy vehicle drivers following the vehicle having an illuminated license plate. This also enhances the ornamental appearance of the vehicle

It is respectfully submitted that the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 16, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

at least one of mirror and a lens configured to direct the light beam portion that is being passed through the optical waveguide to the license plate and/or the at least one tail light.


A lens or mirror to direct light passing through the waveguide is nowhere taught or suggested in Graves. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 16 are allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In

addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-15 and 17-20 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 16.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
December 27, 2006

Enclosure: New Abstract

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101